

rights. Similar cases have been filed in Portugal, Peru and elsewhere.

"Now that we can really quantify how a child in their lifetime will see so many more of these extreme events . . . it helps make the case," Wright said.

Environmental attorney Dan Galpern, general counsel and director of Climate Protection and Restoration Initiative, agreed that "anticipatory research" like this can help establish governments' and corporations' liability for real harms experienced by kids.

Young people already say climate change has touched their lives and harmed their mental health. In a recent survey of 16- to 25-year-olds, scientists found that three quarters of respondents feared the future and more than half believed they would have less opportunity than their parents. Nearly 60 percent said their governments had betrayed them and future generations—making them feel even more anxious.

"The future for me and everyone who comes after is so insecure," said Emanuel Smari Nielsen, a 14-year-old climate activist from Norway. "When politicians and those with power do not do anything, it makes me feel tired. It almost makes me angry."

Adriana, the 6-year-old, said she feels "super nervous" when she thinks about what the future might hold. In those moments, there's nothing that helps her feel better.

"I just wait till I'm done thinking about it," she said.

Experts say one way to help children cope with climate anxiety is to help them feel empowered to do something about it. The Save the Children report calls for communities, countries and global institutions like the U.N. to give young people a greater role in setting climate policy.

Cormac Buck, an 8-year-old from Savannah, Ga., has decided to stop eating meat (except for the occasional chicken nugget). He is part of a group of kids at his school who have asked teachers and administrators to use fewer fossil fuels.

"Sometimes I hear some depressing things happening, like some animals because of climate change are really close to extinction . . . and I feel sad," he said. "And then I normally try to think of a way to stop that from happening again."

And adults must earn back children's trust, Thiery said, by making the dramatic emissions reductions that have been so long delayed. Our choices now will determine whether kids grow up in a world with four times as many heat waves or seven times as many heat waves, a world with occasional crop failures or chronic food shortages.

"We can still avoid the worst consequences," he said. "That is what gives me strength as a father . . . Their future is in our hands."

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the safety of our children is central to our country's well-being, and we must ensure that, for its part, the Department of Homeland Security is equipped to consider these needs.

The Homeland Security for Children Act would ensure the unique needs of children are taken into account throughout the Department by mandating the DHS Secretary direct all components and offices to consider children when creating policies and implementing programs.

□ 1615

It specifically directs the Department to seek feedback from organizations that represent children when developing and carrying out policies and programs.

H.R. 4426 would also permanently authorize a "children's technical expert" within the Federal Emergency Management Agency to prioritize the interests of children in emergency preparedness, response, and recovery initiatives.

Lastly, the legislation, as introduced by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) would require DHS to report to Congress on the Department's work to incorporate children's interests throughout all its work.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4426, the Homeland Security for Children Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, September 23, 2021.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I write concerning H.R. 4426, the Homeland Security for Children Act. There are certain provisions in this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 4426, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 4426 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, Washington, DC, September 23, 2021.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO, Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4426, the "Homeland Security for Children Act." I recognize that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4426, and I appreciate your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I concur with you that forgoing action on the bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 4426 in the Congressional RECORD during floor consideration of this bill. I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this Nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4426, the Homeland Security for Children Act.

While terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and other large-scale emergencies have devastating effects on our communities that last for years, the impacts on children whose lives are often shaped by such emergencies can be felt throughout our country for decades. This legislation will help ensure that DHS, especially FEMA, is considering those long-term implications in all aspects of its mission and planning.

I commend Representative PAYNE for his tireless effort over the years to support and protect our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 4426. I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's children need our help. Natural disasters have impacted one in three Americans. Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, over 5.5 million children have tested positive, and conditions are not trending in the right direction.

According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, last week, with kids back at school, the number of infected children had exponentially risen to the third highest level since the beginning of the pandemic.

As a partner to schools, which are critical to infrastructure, the Department of Homeland Security has a critical mission to play in helping to protect children. To do so effectively, it is critical that children's unique needs are front and center in DHS programs and policies. Enactment of the Homeland Security for Children Act will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4426, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4426, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE-STOP PILOT PROGRAM ACT OF 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4094) to conduct a pilot program at foreign last point of departure airports to permit passengers and their accessible property to continue on additional flights or flight segments originating in the United States without additional security re-screening, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4094

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “One-Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ONE-STOP SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding 44901(a) of title 49, United States Code, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, is authorized to conduct a pilot program at not more than six foreign last point of departure airports to permit passengers and their accessible property arriving on direct flights or flight segments originating at such participating foreign airports to continue on additional flights or flight segments originating in the United States without additional security re-screening if—

(1) the initial screening was conducted in accordance with an aviation security screening agreement described in subsection (d);

(2) passengers arriving from participating foreign airports are unable to access their checked baggage until the arrival at their final destination; and

(3) upon arrival in the United States, passengers arriving from participating foreign airports do not come into contact with other arriving international passengers or those passengers' property or other persons who have not been screened or subjected to other appropriate security controls required for entry into the airport's sterile area.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS FOR PILOT PROGRAM.**—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall ensure there is no reduction in the level of security or specific aviation security standards or requirements for screening passengers and their property prior to boarding an international flight bound for the United States, including specific aviation security standards and requirements regarding the following:

(1) High risk passengers and their property.

(2) Weapons, explosives, and incendiaries.

(3) Screening passengers and property transferring at a foreign last point of departure airport from another airport and bound for the United States, and addressing any co-mingling of such passengers and property with passengers and property screened under the pilot program described in subsection (a).

(4) Insider risk at foreign last point of departure airports.

(c) **RE-SCREENING OF CHECKED BAGGAGE.**—The Administrator may determine whether checked baggage arriving from participating foreign airports referenced in subsection (a) must be re-screened in the United States by an explosives detection system before such baggage continues on any additional flight or flight segment.

(d) **AVIATION SECURITY SCREENING AGREEMENT DESCRIBED.**—An aviation security screening agreement described in this subsection is an agreement signed by the Administrator, without delegating such authority, and entered into with a foreign country that delineates and implements security standards and protocols utilized at a foreign last point of departure airport that are determined by the Administrator to be comparable to those of the United States and therefore sufficiently effective to enable passengers and their accessible property to deplane into sterile areas of airports in the United States without the need for re-screening.

(e) **RE-SCREENING REQUIREMENT.**—If the Administrator determines that the foreign country participating in the aviation security screening agreement has not maintained and implemented security standards and protocols comparable to those of the United States at foreign last point

of departure airports at which a pilot program has been established in accordance with this section, the Administrator shall ensure that passengers and their property arriving from such airports are re-screened in the United States before such passengers and their property are permitted into sterile areas of airports in the United States. In the case of continued or egregious failure to maintain such security standards and protocols, the Administrator shall suspend or terminate the aviation security screening agreement, as determined appropriate by the Administrator, and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such suspension or termination, as the case may be, not later than seven days after such suspension or termination.

(f) **CERTIFICATIONS AND BRIEFINGS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days before an aviation security screening agreement in accordance with subsection (d) enters into force, the Administrator shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

(1) A copy of such agreement.

(2) A homeland security threat assessment for the country in which such foreign last point of departure airport is located, information on any corresponding mitigation efforts to address any security issues identified in such threat assessment, and the Administrator's plans for ensuring through joint covert testing or other measures compliance with the security standards and protocols set forth in such agreement.

(3) A certification that such agreement satisfies all requirements specified in subsection (b) or, in the event that one or more of such requirements is not so satisfied, an identification of the unsatisfied requirement and information on what actions will be taken to ensure such remaining requirement is satisfied before such agreement enters into force.

(4) A certification that the Administrator consulted with stakeholders, including air carriers, airport operators, relevant interagency partners, and other stakeholders the Administrator determines appropriate.

(5) A detailed briefing on the substance of paragraphs (1) through (4).

(g) **SUNSET.**—The pilot program described in subsection (a) shall terminate six years after the date of enactment of this section.

(h) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than five years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Administrator, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the implementation of the pilot program described in subsection (a), including information relating to the following:

(1) The impact to homeland security and international aviation security, including any benefits and challenges, of such pilot program.

(2) The impact to passengers, airports, and air carriers, including any benefits and challenges, of such pilot program.

(3) The impact and feasibility of continuing such pilot program or expanding into a more permanent program, including any benefits and challenges.

(i) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as limiting the authority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to inspect persons and baggage arriving in the United States in accordance with applicable law.

(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATION; TSA.**—The terms “Administration” and “TSA” mean the Transportation Security Administration.

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

(3) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on

Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4094, the One-Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021.

This legislation seeks to simplify and streamline the security screening process for certain international air travelers arriving in the U.S.

It does so by directing the Transportation Security Administration to carry out a pilot program to allow passengers arriving from certain foreign airports to proceed directly to their connecting flights in the United States without having to go through the domestic security screening process.

Under current law, TSA is required to screen international passengers and their belongings upon their arrival in the U.S. before they can continue on to a connecting flight at a domestic airport. In practice, this means that upon landing, passengers must go through a TSA checkpoint with their carry-on items and have their checked baggage rescreened by TSA.

Under the pilot program required under H.R. 4094, arriving international passengers would forego TSA screening when transferring to a domestic flight if they originated from certain airports where strong security measures are in place on the front end.

As amended, this bill requires foreign airports participating in the pilot to uphold security screening standards and procedures that are comparable to those used by TSA. In doing so, passengers and their belongings at these airports will be securely screened before they arrive in the United States so they can more easily catch their connecting flight to their final destination.

Beyond an improved passenger experience, requiring security standards and protocols at foreign airports to be on par with those used in the U.S. could help strengthen aviation security around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years after 9/11, enhancing transportation security remains a critical priority. With that, I support H.R. 4094, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4094, the One-Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021. This legislation will allow TSA to conduct a pilot program with select foreign airports that will make international air travel both more secure and more efficient.

Streamlining international aviation security for passengers from certified foreign airports would not only encourage airports around the globe to reach U.S. security standards, but it will also help revitalize a struggling international aviation industry. This innovative pilot program shows that it is possible to have both better security and a more seamless passenger experience.

I thank Ranking Member KATKO for his tireless work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring this legislation to where it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 4094, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the ranking member.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4094, the One-Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021 authorizes the Transportation Security Administration to establish a pilot program to streamline international travel and enhance aviation security.

Specifically, under this bill, international travelers from certified last point of departure airports would not need to be rescreened upon arrival in the United States for their domestic connecting flight.

H.R. 4094 will improve international aviation security since participating LPD airports must elevate their level of security to that of the United States in order to be certified. Given the desire and competition among international airports to participate, the one-stop security pilot will help to raise the global baseline of aviation security.

The bill ensures robust oversight of the pilot program by requiring TSA to brief and certify to Congress that security standards are maintained at participating pilot airports. Additionally, the pilot program will inform Congress and DHS as to whether a more permanent one-stop program is practical and beneficial to U.S. aviation security.

One-stop screening would enable TSA to better utilize its screening workforce and technology to help facilitate the increased travel volume as we emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Just this morning, the TSA administrator testified before the Committee on Homeland Security about the security and efficiency benefits that this pilot program will have on TSA's operations.

The pilot program will also provide international travelers with a more seamless and efficient travel experi-

ence. Travelers will no longer have to rush to be rescreened by TSA during their layover and will have more time at the airport without fear of missing their connecting flights.

The aviation industry will also realize efficiencies as a result of this bill. Air carriers will potentially be able to shorten connection times for travelers and streamline staffing at participating airports. U.S. airports will also see benefits as connecting travelers will have more time to dine and shop while on their layover. This is critically important as the travel and tourism industry continues to struggle with the effects of this brutal pandemic.

For these reasons, and many others, aviation and travel industry stakeholders are very enthusiastic about this legislation, and I appreciate their strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from Airlines for America, the American Association of Airport Executives, and the Airports Council International North America.

AIRLINES FOR AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2021.

Ranking Member JOHN KATKO,
House Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER KATKO: I write to express Airlines for America's (A4A) robust support for H.R. 4094, the "One-Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021." This bill would serve as a critical tool for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), partner governments and the commercial aviation industry to pilot innovative ways to increase security at foreign last point of departure airports while increasing efficiency of screening for passengers and baggage within the United States.

This bill would authorize a pilot program at 10 or fewer foreign last point of departure airports, permitting passengers flying from these airports and their carry-on baggage to continue to additional flights or flight segments within the U.S. without additional security rescreening. U.S. airlines have collaborated positively with the TSA on similar initiatives for years, but unfortunately our collective efforts have been stymied by outdated requirements in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act.

By permitting the TSA to pilot a new concept in a safe and controlled manner, it will be possible to demonstrate how such security enhancement programs may be permanently and broadly implemented. The bill is consistent with standards and recommended practices set by the International Civil Aviation Organization and puts the United States in a position to lead the international community on modern approaches to enhance aviation security.

Safety and security are always the top priorities of A4A and our member airlines, and we are encouraged that this bill maintains the high aviation security standards for flights into and within the United States. Upon passage, we look forward to continued collaboration with the TSA on all One-Stop security efforts.

On behalf of the commercial U.S. aviation industry, A4A strongly supports this legislation. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

LAUREN BEYER,
Vice President, Security and Facilitation,
Airlines for America.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
AIRPORT EXECUTIVES,
Alexandria, VA, June 29, 2021.

Hon. JOHN KATKO,
Ranking Members, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER KATKO: On behalf of the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) and the thousands of men and women across the country who manage and operate our nation's airports, thank you for your continued leadership in Congress on aviation security issues. I am writing to express AAAE's support for the "One Stop Pilot Program Act of 2021" that you introduced earlier this week.

This legislation would permit the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to conduct a three-year pilot program at up to 10 airports at which connecting passengers' and their carry-on baggage would not need to be rescreened upon arrival in the United States before connecting to another domestic flight provided that the last point of departure airport has a commensurate level of screening to the U.S. Some of AAAE's airport members had been exploring this concept with TSA prior to the COVID-19 pandemic as a way to eliminate screening redundancy and improve passenger facilitation. We appreciate the necessary changes your legislation would make to permit this concept to be tested on a pilot basis.

Once international travel is allowed to fully resume, which AAAE and our airport members are eagerly awaiting and working to see implemented as quickly and safely as possible in concert with the federal government, the One Stop Pilot Program will provide additional passenger facilitation solutions to make international travel more seamless and secure.

We appreciate your efforts to advance this security screening concept. Our member airports remain interested in piloting this idea. AAAE stands ready to work with you to advance this legislation.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE K. GUPTA,
Senior Vice President,
Security and Facilitation.

AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL,
June 25, 2021.

Hon. JOHN KATKO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER KATKO: On behalf of Airports Council International-North America, which represents local, regional, and state governing bodies that own and operate commercial airports throughout the United States, I want to share our support of your new bill, H.R. 4094, the One-Stop Pilot Program Act.

Airports welcome the introduction of this important legislation to establish a pilot program at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security that would allow passengers and their baggage departing from approved foreign airports to continue onto their connecting flights without having to go through additional security screening. This one-stop security pilot would create needed efficiencies by eliminating an unnecessary and burdensome rescreening process for passengers and baggage that were subject to a commensurate level of screening at their departing airport. It also would allow TSA to reallocate scarce resources to augment staffing at checkpoint and checked baggage screening locations.

Thank you for your efforts to enhance aviation security and the passenger experience at America's airports. I look forward to

continuing to work with you on these important issues.

Sincerely,

KEVIN M. BURKE,
President and CEO, Airports
Council International—North America.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, lastly, I thank my friend, Representative STEPHANIE MURPHY from Florida, for her partnership on this bipartisan bill, and I thank Chairman THOMPSON, my friend, for his commitment to bringing it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 4094.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the pilot program authorized under H.R. 4094 is intended to provide TSA and its international aviation security partners with an opportunity to streamline travel and enhance security.

Importantly, H.R. 4094 includes essential security guardrails to ensure that the pilot is carried out in a way that does not result in lessened security standards regarding, for example, the carriage of small knives on planes or the transfer of upstream passengers without rescreening.

That is why the legislation, which was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), received bipartisan support when it was approved by the Committee on Homeland Security in July.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4094, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

UNMANNED AERIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4682) to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from operating or procuring certain foreign-made unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4682

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Unmanned Aerial Security Act” or the “UAS Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON OPERATION OR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN FOREIGN-MADE UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON AGENCY OPERATION OR PROCUREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and subsection (c)(3), the Secretary of Homeland Security may not operate, provide financial assistance for, or enter into or renew a contract for the procurement of—

(1) an unmanned aircraft system (UAS) that—

(A) is manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(B) uses flight controllers, radios, data transmission devices, cameras, or gimbals manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(C) uses a ground control system or operating software developed in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country; or

(D) uses network connectivity or data storage located in a covered foreign country or administered by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country;

(2) a software operating system associated with a UAS that uses network connectivity or data storage located in a covered foreign country or administered by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country; or

(3) a system for the detection or identification of a UAS, which system is manufactured in a covered foreign country or by a corporation domiciled in a covered foreign country.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate that a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such subsection that is the subject of such a waiver is required—

(A) in the national interest of the United States;

(B) for counter-UAS surrogate research, testing, development, evaluation, or training; or

(C) for intelligence, electronic warfare, or information warfare operations, testing, analysis, and/or training.

(2) NOTICE.—The certification described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Committees specified in such paragraph by not later than the date that is 14 days after the date on which a waiver is issued under such paragraph.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WAIVER PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a process by which the head of an office or component of the Department of Homeland Security may request a waiver under subsection (b).

(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the prohibition under subsection (a), the head of an office or component of the Department of Homeland Security may continue to operate a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS described in any of subparagraphs (1) through (3) of such

subsection that was in the inventory of such office or component on the day before the effective date of this Act until—

(A) such time as the Secretary of Homeland Security has—

(i) granted a waiver relating thereto under subsection (b), or

(ii) declined to grant such a waiver, or

(B) one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(d) DRONE ORIGIN SECURITY REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a terrorism threat assessment and report that contains information relating to the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Homeland Security has previously analyzed the threat that a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country operating in the United States poses, and the results of such analysis.

(2) The number of UAS, software operating systems associated with a UAS, or systems for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country in operation by the Department, including an identification of the component or office of the Department at issue, as of such date.

(3) The extent to which information gathered by such a UAS, a software operating system associated with a UAS, or a system for the detection or identification of a UAS from a covered foreign country could be employed to harm the national or economic security of the United States.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term “covered foreign country” means a country that—

(A) the intelligence community has identified as a foreign adversary in its most recent Annual Threat Assessment; or

(B) the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, has identified as a foreign adversary that is not included in such Annual Threat Assessment.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given such term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(3) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM; UAS.—The terms “unmanned aircraft system” and “UAS” have the meaning given the term “unmanned aircraft system” in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95; 49 U.S.C. 44802 note).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I